

PATENT  
USSN: 10/079,441

Docket No.: 1232-4823

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Claim Status**

Claims 14-28 and 43-45 are pending in this application and have been rejected. Claims 14, 21, 28 and 43-45 are independent in form. By this amendment, claims 14, 21, 28, and 43-45 are amended. No new matter is presented.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis for the specified limitation and for usage of the term "pasted". Claim 14 has been amended to remove the term "set by the attribution allocation plane setting means" and claims 14, 21, 28, and 43-45 have been amended for clarity to replace use of the term "paste" with the term "allocate".

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 14 be withdrawn as having been overcome or otherwise rendered moot.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103**

Claims 14-18, 21-25, 28 and 43-45 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by the previously cited AutoCAD 2000- 3D Modeling, a Visual Approach" by John Wilson. ("Wilson") and claims 19, 20, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of the previously cited "AutoCad 2000: The Complete Reference" by David Cohn. ("Cohn")

**PATENT**  
**USSN: 10/079,441**

**Docket No.: 1232-4823**

Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization of the pending claims and of the prior art in the stated rejections and respectfully traverse these rejections as follows.

Applicants have herein amended pending independent claims 14, 21, 28 and 43-45 to further clarify the claimed invention.

The Examiner appears to take the position that the view point function disclosed in figs. 16-17 or pages 476-477 of Wilson anticipates the present invention. In the Response to Argument section on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests distinguishing between the abilities of AutoCAD and the current application. In addition to the remarks which follow, the amended claims, which also address the rejections under §112, clarify distinction of the claimed invention over the view point function of AutoCAD.

More specifically, as shown in Fig. 7 of the present application, for example, the present invention is characterized in allocating the virtual plane, at a desired position, on which the attribution information is allocated in the same 3D space in which a 3D model is allocated. According to one aspect of the invention, it is possible to understand which portion of drawings of the 3D model is created, or, after that, which portion of the 3D model should be created.

In contrast, as depicted on Figs. 6-17, AutoCAD discloses that the view point function designates the area of the view point on a 2D drafting and, in the area, a portion created in a model space may be displayed. That is, a plurality of desired portions of a 3D model are displayed on the 2D space. However, such a 2D space displays only a portion of the 3D model, and is not easy to understand which portion of the 3D model is depicted on a drawing. According to the view point function, as a 2D drafting area is limited, it is necessary to create many 2D drawings for most portions of the 3D model in a case where an operator, for example, wishes to visualize most portions of the 3D model as 2D drawings. Accordingly, in the prior art system, it

**PATENT**  
**USSN: 10/079,441**

**Docket No.: 1232-4823**

is difficult to comprehend what is depicted by the created drawings, and which drawings are lacking.

For a least the foregoing reasons, the present invention is different than that in the prior art and is neither taught in nor suggested by the view point function of AutoCAD.

**Dependent Claims:**

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, as the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable for at least the reasons discussed *supra*, the dependent claims are believed allowable for at least similar reasons. Applicants, however, reserve the right to address such rejections should such response be necessary and appropriate.

Accordingly, the present invention as recited in independent claims 14, 21, 28 and 43-45 and the claims depending therefrom is believed neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of, and thus patentably distinct over, the AutoCAD references, i.e., Wilson or Cohn, taken individually or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the present invention as recited in the claims presented herein is believed patentably distinct over the art of record and Applicants respectfully request that the respective rejections be withdrawn and the application be allowed as the application is believed to be hereby placed in condition for allowance.

If any outstanding issues remain, however, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

**PATENT**  
**USPN: 10/079,441**

**Docket No.: 1232-4823**

**AUTHORIZATION**

While no fees or extension of time are believed necessary for this Amendment, should an extension of time be required for the timely submission of this paper, such extension is hereby petitioned, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4823.

An early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 24, 2005

By:

  
Stephen J. Manetta  
Registration No. 40,426

Mailing address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, New York 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700 (Telephone)  
(212) 415-8701 (Facsimile)